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The article in Social Forces by J. M. Bruce (1970) on “Intragenerational Occupational Mobility and Visiting With Kin and Friend” is open to criticism on several points. First, the data presented in Table 1 do not allow the reader to fully reconstruct the basic zero-order relationships. It seems obvious from the chi-square values listed in the footnotes to Table 1 that the original tables were $3 \times 2$ cells since the degrees of freedom cited was 2 in every case. However, data were not presented relative to the categories of visiting other than “visits at least once a week.” A second criticism concerns the fact that no measures of association were cited thus leaving the reader to chi-square values, and those referring, at least partially, to some data that were not available. Third, it should be noted that the numbers and percentages in Table 1 are based on the 323 respondents who had at least one sibling in the Provi-

1 The categories of visiting incidence used by Bruce were: (a) at least once a week; (b) at least once a month; (c) only a few times a year.
idence area and the 305 respondents whose wives had at least one sibling in the same area. No data were presented on the size of the various families of orientation (i.e., numbers of siblings, his and hers), a potentially relevant factor since the dependent variable was visiting incidence with his or her siblings. The fourth criticism concerns the interpretations derived from the data analysis. In his abstract, Bruce states: "The major contrast was assumed to be between mobile and nonmobile individuals and not between socioeconomic strata or due to the direction of mobility (up vs. down) ... . With present socioeconomic level controlled, mobility was found to be related to a lower frequency of visiting with siblings, both the respondent's and his wife's."

The purposes of this critique are to reconstruct and reanalyze some of the data presented by Bruce in Table 1 and to offer another interpretation of these data.

**SECTIONS A AND B, TABLE 1**

The relationships here deal with intragenerational occupational mobility and the incidence of visiting (at least once a week versus less than once a week) with all of the respondent's siblings and all of his wife's siblings who live in the same metropolitan area, controlling on the present SES level of the respondents. The findings which emerge from this reanalysis are somewhat different from those outlined by Bruce. (1) The relationship among occupational mobility and visiting incidence with siblings is specified (see Rosenberg, 1968), regardless of whose siblings are considered, his or hers. In both cases, for his (section A) and his wife's siblings (section B), the relationship was stronger for those respondents whose present SES level was low. (2) Among lower SES respondents there was a statistically significant difference between the stable and mobile with regard to the frequency of visiting. (3) Among those respondents who were higher in SES the differences in visiting frequencies relative to occupational mobility and stability were not statistically significant.

**DISCUSSION**

Thus, these data seem to suggest that occupational mobility does, in a purely relative sense, tend to disrupt visiting incidence with his and her siblings for the lower SES respondents. It could very well be true that the low SES mobile

---

**Table 1. The Relationship among Occupational Mobility and Visiting with His or His Wife's Siblings: Zero-Order Tables and Partial Tables Controlling on Respondent's Present SES Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Incidence</th>
<th>Occupational Mobility Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zero-Order Tables**

- **Males**
  - Once a week: 89(49.2), 46(32.4), 94(54.6), 51(38.3)
  - Less than once: 92(50.8), 96(67.6), 78(45.4), 82(61.7)
  - Value of chi-square: 9.21, 8.00
  - Value of gamma: +.338, +.319

- **Females**
  - Once a week: 89(49.2), 46(32.4), 94(54.6), 51(38.3)
  - Less than once: 92(50.8), 96(67.6), 78(45.4), 82(61.7)
  - Value of chi-square: 9.21, 8.00
  - Value of gamma: +.338, +.319

**Section A - Males**

- Low-SES
  - Once a week: 64(51.2), 20(33.9), 25(44.6), 26(31.3)
  - Less than once: 61(48.8), 39(66.1), 31(55.4), 57(68.6)
  - Value of chi-square: 4.84, 2.55
  - Value of gamma: +.343, +.278

- Hi-SES
  - Once a week: 20(33.9), 39(66.1), 31(55.4), 57(68.6)
  - Less than once: 61(48.8), 39(66.1), 31(55.4), 57(68.6)
  - Value of chi-square: 8.09, .99
  - Value of gamma: +.446, +.169
respondents have lower visiting incidences with his and her siblings because they are the only ones in their familial network who have moved in the occupational hierarchy. Thus stigmatized as the "white sheep" in the family they are isolated and perhaps isolate themselves from their intragenerational peer group. In other words, perhaps the most relevant data for Bruce to examine would be the visiting incidences with siblings who are occupationally mobile or stable relative to the respondent's mobility or stability, controlling on the respondent's present SES level.
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It is certainly irritating to find insufficient information in a research paper on which a judgment as to the adequacy of the analysis presented can be based. Although certain data are often so clearly necessary that little debate is possible, the amount of detail needed may often be a matter of debate. This instance may be an example of both situations. The information in question was included in the longer original version of the paper, but as there was a need to shorten the paper for publication in this journal the more detailed presentation of the data was summarized. Although Clayton was not able to fully reconstruct the $2 \times 3$ tables found in the original version, little information was lost in his $2 \times 2$ tables because of the small numbers in the infrequent visiting category. These data did further show the lower rate of visiting of the mobile respondents. The collapsing of cells did not, however, distort the findings. A fuller presentation of these data in the published article did not seem of high priority.  

The averages for the number of siblings in the respondents' families of orientation still alive at the time of the interview were: high SES stable—2.4, high SES mobile—3.6, low SES stable—3.8, and low SES mobile—3.9. The averages for the wives' siblings were: high SES stable—2.8, high SES mobile—3.5, low SES stable—3.6, and low SES mobile—3.6. These data did not seem to indicate that the frequency with which respondents visited their siblings (or wives' siblings) depended greatly on the number available.

The main purpose of the original analysis of the data (portions of which are reanalyzed by Clayton) was to explore a few ideas about the consequences of mobility for participation in interpersonal relationships (if any). Several contradictory hypotheses have been put forward, including the belief that mobility per se is related to a lower rate of participation in primary relations. The research hypothesis which guided the research was based on this assumption. In regards to visiting with siblings, it was concluded that the data tended to provide some evidence in support of such a

were: high SES level—.186, low SES level—.208. The values of $C$ for the data concerned with wives' siblings were: high SES level—.093, low SES level—.292.